

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/038,718	01/02/2002	Paul M. Lizardi	25006.0001U5	4062
75	90 10/22/2003		EXAMINER	
Robert A. Hodges NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.			WHISENANT, ETHAN C	
The Candler Building, Suite 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
127 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30303-1811			1634	
			DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/038,718	LIZARDI, PAUL M.
		Examin r	Art Unit
		Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D.	1634
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet with	the corresp ndence address
THE I - External after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply cation. lays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH, by statute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>14 July 2003</u> .	
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) <u></u> Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice ion of Claims		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 43-50 is/are pending in the ap	pplication.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration.	
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 43-50 is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ion Papers	n and/or election requirement.	
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.	
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 January 200</u>	<u>2</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objecte	ed to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any object		
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed o	n is: a)□ approved b)□ disa	approved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are requi	red in reply to this Office action.	
12) 🗌	The oath or declaration is objected to by	y the Examiner.	
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo	r foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	l19(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received in App	olication No
* 5	 Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internati See the attached detailed Office action f 	onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	·	
_a) The translation of the foreign language. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	uage provisional application has bee	n received.
Attachmen	_		,
1)	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape	9-948) 5) Notice of Info	mmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/038,718 Page 2

Art Unit: 1634

Non-Final Action

1. The applicant's election of Group I (Claims 1-31) with traverse in the paper filed 15 JUL 03 is acknowledged. It is also noted that Claims 1-42 have been canceled and new Claims 43-50 added. The applicant has traversed the restriction requirement arguing that there is not an undue burden on the examiner to search both groups. The applicant's argument has been fully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive. A *prima facie* case of burden has been shown because the two inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification. Because the restriction requirement is deemed proper it is herein made **FINAL**. An action on **Claim(s) 43-50** follows.

SEQUENCE RULES

2. This application complies with the sequence rules and the sequences have been entered by the Scientific and Technical Information Center.

DRAWINGS

3. The drawings filed with this application have been approved under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (F d. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- **5.** Claim(s) 43-50 is/are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over Claims 1-12 of U. S. Patent No. 6,344,329 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the 329' patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical they are not patentablly distinct.
- **6.** Claim(s) 43-50 is/are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over Claims 1-26 of U. S. Patent No. 6,210,884 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the 884' patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical they are not patentablly distinct.

REASON FOR ALLOWANCE

7. Besides the double patenting rejections, **Claim(s) 43-50** is/are allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art considered does not teach or reasonably suggest the nucleic acid amplification/detection method(s) recited in Claims 43-50.

CONCLUSION

8. Claim(s) 43-50 is/are rejected and/or objected to for the reason(s) set forth above.

Application/Control Number: 10/038,718 Page 4

Art Unit: 1634

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-6567. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30AM -5:30PM EST or any time via voice mail. If repeated attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached at (703) 308-1152.

The fax number for this Examiner is (703) 746-8465. Before faxing any papers please inform the examiner to avoid lost papers. Please note that the faxing of papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

ETHAN WHISENANT PRIMARY EXAMINER